

REMARKS:

A Request for continued Examination, along with a Information Disclosure Statement, is being filed concurrently herewith.

No claims have been amended. Claims 1-57 are pending in this application. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 26-29.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants wish to note that the PTO-1449 form filed with an Information Disclosure Statement on October 12, 2004, was not returned by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the initialed PTO-1449 form from the IDS filed on Oct. 12, 2004, as well as from the IDS being filed concurrently herewith, be returned with the next communication.

Claims 1-25 and 30-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action contends that the limitation introduced by claims 25, 44 and 57 confuses the claimed limitation of claims 1, 30 and 45, respectively, causing claims 1, 30 and 45 to be indefinite. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 includes the limitation of "sending said encrypted document from said data center to said destination device based on said identifying information." Claim 25, dependent upon claim 1, includes the limitations of "wherein said step of sending said encrypted document from said data center to said destination device further comprises first sending said encrypted document from said data center to said mobile device; and then sending said encrypted document from said mobile device to said destination device." Thus, claim 25 further limits claim 1 by defining a path that the document takes when being sent from the data center to the destination device, i.e., the document is sent from the data center to the destination device through the mobile device. There are no relationships/steps that can go on indefinitely as contended by the Office Action, and it is clear that the document starts at the data center and ends at the

destination device in each of the claims. Note that there could be any number of intermediaries in the transport path between the data center and the destination device - the limitation of claim 1 requires only that the document be sent from the data center to the destination device. Claim 1 does not require any specific path that the document must follow to get from the data center to the destination device. Claim 25 further limits claim 1 by defining a transport path that the document follows to get from the data center to the destination device, i.e., through the mobile device.

The Office Action includes an example of "A gives B a message. This language clearly means the message is passed from A to B." This only means that A sends a message to B, but does not define a particular path by which the message must be sent. If, for example, the message is being sent electronically, it could be passed through any number of routers/ports (C) when A sends it to B. If this limitation were further defined to indicate that the message is sent from A to B through C, e.g., a specific router or port, this would not make either limitation indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitation in claim 25 of further defining that the document is passed through the mobile device when it is sent from the data center to the destination device is not indefinite and does not cause confusion as contended by the Office Action. Claims 30, 44, 45 and 57 are also not indefinite for the same reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 25. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. A. Lemm', written over a horizontal line.

Brian A. Lemm
Reg. No. 43,748
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone No.: (203) 924-3836

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000